

**Subject:** Re: Doe v. Johnson City et al.

**Date:** Friday, November 3, 2023 at 12:56:12 PM Central Daylight Time

**From:** Vanessa Baehr-Jones

**To:** Daniel H Rader IV

**CC:** Heather Collins, Emily Taylor, Ashley Walter, Ben C. Allen, Kristin E. Berexa (kberexa@fbb.law), Lisa May, Maria Ashburn, Elizabeth Kramer, Kevin Osborne

Daniel,

You tell us that you are bringing a motion to dismiss based on an SOL defense but won't provide any of the dates or facts you believe are relevant, and then claim that none of these dates are, in fact, relevant to your defense. When we point out that your defense is meritless based on the law, you then claim the relevant SOL case law has nothing to do with your motion and you are only meeting and conferring on the facts as alleged, though again, you refuse to specify which facts. We strongly discourage you from bringing a frivolous motion, as this is a waste of the Court's time, especially considering that the complaint you intend to challenge may shortly not be the operative complaint. Moreover, in the second amended class complaint, your client is not named in his individual capacity in the 1983 claims which you state you intend to challenge based on your SOL defense. But, of course, you can file whatever you want.

-Vanessa